IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

THURSDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MS JUSTICE G.ROHINI

WRIT PETITION NO : 23878 of 2003

Between:

1. Raju Singh, S/o Late Ratan Singh, and 20 others

..... PETITIONERS

AND

1. The A.P. Industrial Infrastructure Corporation Ltd.,

represented by its Managing Director,
Parishram Bhavan, Basheerabagh,
Hyderabad.
2. Indian Business School, Rep. by its Managing Director,
Gachi Bowli.
3. The District Collector, R.R.District.

.....RESPONDENTS

The Court made the following:

ORDER:

When a miscellaneous petition filed by the writ petitioners is listed for consideration, with the consent of the learned counsel for both parties, the main writ petition is heard and decided.

The main writ petition is filed seeking a declaration that the alleged action of the

respondents in constructing the compound wall and laying roads in the lands of the petitioners admeasuring Ac.4.00 cents situated in Survey No.210/2 at Manikonda village, Rajendranagar Mandal, Ranga Reddy District, without initiating any proceedings for acquisition of the same under the provisions of the Land Acquisition Act, is arbitrary and illegal.

Though initially, this Court by order dated 13.11.2003 while directing Rule Nisi, ordered that Status quo obtaining as on that date, shall be maintained, it appears that subsequently the said interim order was vacated on 19.07.2005.

Be that as it may, now the learned counsel for the writ petitioners represented that during the pendency of this writ petition, a notification under Section 4(1) of the Land Acquisition Act has been published on 26.04.2005 and the award enquiry is in progress. The learned counsel for the petitioner also states that though the names of the writ petitioners were not shown in the notification issued under Section 4 (1) of the Act, since the petitioners claim title to the land in question, they filed their respective claim petitions on 17.06.2005 before the Land Acquisition Officer.

In the light of the subsequent events, I am of the view that no adjudication on merits is necessary in this writ petition.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of making it clear that the claim petitions said to have been made by the petitioners seeking compensation shall be considered in accordance with law. No costs.

_____

(G. ROHINI, J)

Date: 15.09.2005

Ksn